

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Advanced Research and Reports</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJARR_93129
Title of the Manuscript:	WORK ENGAGEMENT AND TEACHING PERFORMANCE OF PUBLIC-SCHOOL PHYSICS TEACHERS IN THE NEW NORMAL
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### **General guideline for Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajarr.com/index.php/AJARR/editorial-policy> )

**Review Form 1.6**

**PART 1: Review Comments**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>Abstract</b> The abstract is far too long. It should not exceed 300 words in length.</p> <p>Language is a problem. E.g.: The first sentence (much too long) is not clear to me. First sentence Results also unclear.</p> <p><b>Introduction:</b> You write: Of the studies cited and others reviewed, none so far focused on exploring the correlation between work engagement and teaching performance of public school teachers, specifically Physics teachers in the large school division in Central Philippines. Hence, there is an evidence of a gap in literature. I think that evidence of a gap is too strong. There is more than the cited and reviewed studies. You can write that you want to contribute to the knowledgeable of ....</p> <p><b>Research problem</b> First sentence not clear. And what is new normal? A research problem is often the reason why the research takes place. Why do you want to know the extent of work engagement? What is the research question? (E.g. To what extent ....)</p> <p><b>Theoretical Framework</b> This is not very robust.</p> <p>“ Furthermore, the performance management perspective tends to treat effective teaching as an individual endeavor and thus seeks solutions focused on enhancing the identification and distribution of effective teachers in high-minority, high-poverty schools “ This is a citation. That's why you have to mention the page number of the article and place it between brackets.</p> <p>In the TF you mention the items from the theory which you use in the result section. EG: vigor, dedication, absorption etc. And you describe what YOU mean with it.</p> <p><b>2.2</b> Mention tables and figures in the text. Tell (Table 1) what is N, n and % in the title.</p> <p>Describe how to present the data (Tables) and mention : 0.00-0.86=Never (Ne), 0.87-1.71=Almost Never (AN), 1.72-2.57=Rarely (Ra), 2.58-3.43=Sometimes (So), 3.44-4.29=Often (Of), 4.30-5.14=Very Often (VO), 5.15-6.00=Always</p> <p>3.1 “ Overall, the extent of the work engagement of the Physics teachers is very often “ Unclear, try such as: Teachers very often mention (or choose) work engagement .....</p> <p>Please do not write what we can read in the table! Present the table and discuss what is special. More like the end of the 4th , the 5th , the 7th, and ... paragraph.</p>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	References in the list are not all conform the format. In the text it is not common to you et al. the first time for less than 7 authors.	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

[Review Form 1.6](#)

**PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

**Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>Adri Dierdorp</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>Freudenthal Institute, Utrecht University, Netherlands</b>